

Grant, Drew

From: Ash, Amy
Sent: Friday, May 22, 1998 9:38 AM
To: Grant, Drew
Subject: FW: FW: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome

Drew, still trying to work out a meeting with Vohden of DOMW re Anvil and Dexter Cks, but, their take on it so far is that it should be Tier III. Sorry for the delay in getting the info to you, DOMW thinks these creeks are more in the mining enforcement realm, vs a full 303d list, but I have been operating under the schedules of others... later, amy del norte'

From: Jim Vohden
To: Ash, Amy
Subject: Re: FW: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome
Date: Wednesday, May 06, 1998 3:49PM

Ok, I throw up my hands in ignorance.....any chance you, me and Ryan Hull can get together Friday afternoon to discuss this?

It seemed to us that by Drew Grant's email, the tier III was more appropriate--to monitor and assess the recovery as planned. But I think we'd both like to get the whole story on it.

--- On 06 May 98 15:06:00 KDT aash@envircon.state.ak.us wrote:

>
> Tier II - Waters which have had completed assessments and now require a
> waterbody recovery plan or a TMDL, amy

> -----
> **From:** Jim Vohden
> **To:** Ash, Amy
> **Subject:** Re: FW: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome
> **Date:** Wednesday, May 06, 1998 2:01PM

>
>
> what is tier II then?

>
>
> --- On 06 May 98 13:58:00 KDT aash@envircon.state.ak.us wrote:

>>
>> anytime on the Steese, and, NO, I think he meant what he typed "II". amy

>> -----
>> **From:** Jim Vohden
>> **To:** Ash, Amy
>> **Subject:** Re: FW: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome
>> **Date:** Wednesday, May 06, 1998 1:35PM

>>
>>
>>
>> did Drew mean Tier III in his last sentence?

>>
>> We should talk sometime about the Steese work--

>>
>> --- On 06 May 98 13:21:00 KDT aash@envircon.state.ak.us wrote:

>>>
>>> More "they-speak" amy

>>> -----
>>> **From:** Grant, Drew
>>> **To:** McLean, Mac
>>> **Cc:** Ash, Amy
>>> **Subject:** RE: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome
>>> **Date:** Wednesday, May 06, 1998 12:00PM

>>>
>>> MAC - good job! thanks very much for the reply on this (I'm not sure if
> I

>>> already replied, but if I did, thanks again).

>>> So from what it sounds: based on the effort you and the Div of Mining
> did
>>> (i.e., development of remediation plans) there is a presumption that the
>>> situation is under "control" with the proviso that a follow-up
> inspection
>> is
>>> needed - -correct? We have what we call a Tier III waterbody
> category/list
>>
>>> which means the waters on the list will tracked and monitored over the
>> next
>>> two years to validate the waters are recovering. Based on what I'm
>> hearing
>>> I might suggest that we consider placing both of these creeks on the
> Tier
>> II
>>> list, would you concur with that???

>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: McLean, Mac
>>> Sent: Friday, May 01, 1998 9:42 AM
>>> To: Grant, Drew
>>> Subject: RE: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome

>>> Drew - sorry for the delay - I've been in Seattle.

>>> There is no question but that both creeks are impaired. Both have been
>>> historically dredged - pre-WWIII (Anvil Creek three times; Dexter Creek
> at
>>> least once). Dredge piles and spoils remain. Concerns about water
>> quality
>>> became an issue about 4 years ago with new mine developments and the
> blow
>>> out of two settling ponds on Anvil Creek and one on Dexter Creek.
> Similar
>>> complaints have been received each succeeding spring. Sediment from the
>>> Dexter Creek blowout ran into the Nome River and discolored it for miles
>>> downstream. Accumulated sediment was still evident at the mouth of
> Dexter
>>> Creek last summer.

>>> The Division of Mining and I and Scott Miller (AK Gold - property owner)
>>> visited these sites last summer and developed remediation plans to
>> minimize
>>> recurrent non-point source pollution and the pond blowouts. Each
> operator
>>> complied with the plan. A site visit will be conducted this spring to
>>> verify whether it has permanently corrected the problems.

>>> I have anecdotal information on water quality violations but no recent
>>> samples from these operators.

>>> -----
>>> From: Grant, Drew
>>> To: Ash, Amy; McLean, Mac; Johnson, Lee
>>> Subject: Anvil and Dexter Creeks -- Nome
>>> Date: Tuesday, April 28, 1998 7:30PM

>>> Hi Mac, Amy, Lee - can any of you help me out a little here (I know Mac
>>> can because you apparently have looked at these two creeks on the
>>> ground)....? but during our solicitation for water quality information
>>> and nominations of impaired (303(d)) waters I received a phone call and
> a
>>> letter from a "Derrick Leedy" of Nome reporting water quality problems
>>> from mining activity surrounding the above two creeks.

>>> He says that the primary and secondary recharge area for Moonlight

> > > Springs (DW source) is now being mined.
> > >
> > > Are you aware of any of this? Is there any substance to it? this guy is
> > > asking that we take enforcement action....? He urged us to list the
> > > waters on our "impaired waterbody" list, but we can't do without some
> > > documentation, etc. of persistent exceedances of WQ standards.
> > >
> > > I can fax the letter to any/all of you, but if you have info on this
> > > please forward.

> > >
> > > Thanks for your help -- drew
> > >

> > >
> > -----End of Original Message-----
> > >

> > ~~~~~
> > >

> > Jim Vohden <jimv@dnr.state.ak.us>
> > >

> > (907)451-2772
> > >

> > 05/06/98 13:25:07
> > >

> > -----
> > >

> > >
> > -----End of Original Message-----
> > >

> > ~~~~~
> > >

> > Jim Vohden <jimv@dnr.state.ak.us>
> > >

> > (907)451-2772
> > >

> > 05/06/98 13:56:47
> > >

> > -----
> > >

>

-----End of Original Message-----

~~~~~

Jim Vohden <jimv@dnr.state.ak.us>

(907)451-2772

05/06/98 15:42:11

-----

Derrick Leedy  
Nome, Alaska

2-1-00

To the City Council Members of Nome Alaska

Dear Councilmen,

### Moonlight Springs Aquifer

My vision is that we all need to realize that we have a single source aquifer that needs protection from contamination and dewatering.

Our first goal is to determine that APP did not apply or have a Watershed Development Permit for 1999. APP needs to be notified of this violation.

Today the mining operation is on hold because of winter conditions and the operator assumes he can continue starting around June 1, 2000 without a Watershed Development Permit. APP had been a constant violator of the State of Alaska Fish and Game Habitat Permit as well as ADEC water quality standards for Anvil Creek.

How did we Get Here? APP mining was closer to Anvil Creek on the west side of Glacier Creek Road. Now APP is east of the road on the side of Anvil Mountain and are hundreds of feet above Moonlight Springs in elevation. APP is intercepting ground water flows from Anvil Mountain that are used in the wash plant. In the DNR hydrogeology report it said "Should large-scale mining activity near the mapped boundaries (of the recharge areas) result in major changes to local ground-water flow systems, the location of recharge areas would also change." Also, as a community we felt helpless the we could put a stop to this activity in our watershed.

What should we do and what are our available options? We need to issue watershed permits for the watershed. The City Council and the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to review the applications.

### Recommendations

We need to issue watershed permits for the watershed

The City of Nome should have input into what happens in our watershed

Next we need the ADEC to make Nome a priority in their new Alaska's Drinking Water Protection Program. ADEC will do a "vulnerability assessment" for our drinking water source. This assessment can be used by Nome to decide where efforts are needed to protect our source(s) of public drinking water from contamination.

Until this review is completed we should only allow supervised reclamation in our watershed

Respectfully,

dwpp@envirocon.state.ak.us

Derrick Leedy

cc. ADFG, Utility Board of Nome, Planning Commission of Nome, ADEC

Drinking water protection program  
555 Cordova Street, Anchorage, AK 995 (907)262-7549